Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 7 1983
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 82–2142
and, A–10

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1982

IN RE: JANICE CHING YEE, Petitioner Pro Se;

v.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, (HSC#7067)*, Respondent; and
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, INC. (HSC#7355)*,
Respondent; and
CONTRIBUTORY RESPONDENTS by Joinder**,
Respondents.

ON EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO HAWAII SUPREME COURT, RE: CASES #7067* & #7355,*
by JOINT PETITION
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF‡
ACCORDING TO FRCP+, RULE 60(b)(2)

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW, AND ARGUMENTS
IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE++

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Petitioner Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
ph: (808) 595-3426

*correction, inclusion per FRCP+, Rule 60(b)(1) Hawaii Supreme Court cases

** per FRCP+, Rules 18, 19(a) & 42(a), for II. Statement of Parties Involved in JOINT PETITION.

‡ with JOINT PETITION's Affidavit pertinent yet.

+ Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

++ for listing of all names of Counsel for/or Respondents.

No. 82–2142
and, A–10

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1982

IN RE: JANICE CHING YEE, Petitioner Pro Se;

v.

ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, (HSC#7067)*, Respondent; and
ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, INC. (HSC#7355)*,
Respondent; and
CONTRIBUTORY RESPONDENTS by Joinder**,
Respondents.

ON EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO HAWAII SUPREME COURT, RE: CASES #7067* & #7355,*
by JOINT PETITION
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF‡
ACCORDING TO FRCP+, RULE 60(b)(2)

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW, AND ARGUMENTS
IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE++

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Petitioner Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817
ph: (808) 595-3426

*correction, inclusion per FRCP+, Rule 60(b)(1) Hawaii Supreme Court cases

** per FRCP+, Rules 18, 19(a) & 42(a), for II. Statement of Parties Involved in JOINT PETITION.

‡ with JOINT PETITION's Affidavit pertinent yet.

+ Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

++ for listing of all names of Counsel for/or Respondents.

No. 82–2142
and, A–10
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1982

IN RE: JANICE CHING YEE, (JCY) Petitioner Pro Se; v. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, Respondent and ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, INC. Respondent, and CONTRIBUTORY RESPONDENTS by Joinder, Respondents.	HSC#7067 and HSC#7355 Honorable Justices of Hawaii Supreme Court HFC–D#81258 Hon.Judge J.Burns Hawaii Family Court+ HCC#55669 Hon.Judge A. Fong +Hawaii Circuit Crt. First Circuit

JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF
ACCORDING TO FRCP+, RULE 60(b)(2)

Comes now, Petitioner Pro Se Janice Ching Yee (JCY), with this JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF, ACCORDING TO FRCP+, RULE 60(b)(2), for "newly discovered evidence which by due dilligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial", and which was prohibited, by the lower courts' "malicious abuse of judicial process", causing hardship by depriving violation of "equal protection of the laws" for Petitioner JCY.

The JURISDICTION of this Court to consider this JOINT MOTION arises from action of all LAW pled, in particular RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S., (USSCR) RULES 17(b & c), 26, 33.7. and 42(c); FRCP+, RULE 26 for DISCOVERY, especially Documents of Discovery, and RULE 60(b)(2), as pled above, and RULE 60(b)(6) for relief from prejudiced members of this court, as Justice Rehnquist, who should recuse out of fairness to Petitioner, who prays for propriety for this case; and all U.S.CONSTITUTION AMENDMENTS pled.

+ inadvertance of footnotes on p. 2.

The basis for this JOINT MOTION arises from all reasonable pleas* by Petitioner JCY, suffering yet from unconstitutional, unreasonable denials.

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Petitioner Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Ave., Hon., HI 96817
Dated, September 1, 1983.

*correction of inadvertance, per cover.
+Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, FRCP hereon.

No. 82–2142
and, A–10

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1982

IN RE: JANICE CHING YEE, (JCY) Petitioner Pro Se; v. ALFRED ALPHONSE YEE, Respondent and ALFRED A. YEE & ASSOCIATES, INC.) Respondent, and CONTRIBUTORY RESPONDENTS by Joinder, Respondents.	HSC#7067 and HSC#7355 Honorable Justices of Hawaii Supreme Court HFC–D#81258 Hon.Judge J.Burns Hawaii Family Court+ HCC#55669 Hon.Judge A. Fong +Hawaii Circuit Crt. First Circuit

MEMORANDUMS OF LAW, AND ARGUMENTS,
IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION

Comes now, Petitioner Pro Se JCY, with JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF, ACCORDING TO FRCP, RULE 60(b)(2), for "newly discovered evidence" as motioned.

This "new evidence" was presented to this Court (sent) from Honolulu, Hawaii, by certified mail) on August 2, 1983, in typewritten form, and incorrectly titled, now corrected, and to include additional evidence, with timeliness intent and all pertinence of Petitioner's AFFIDAVIT of the JOINT PETITION applicable, for acceptance by this court for its review/consideration of this "new evidence"; and for best review/determination of Petitioner's EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF CERTIORARI, #82–2142, for this "new evidence":

1. that, Petitioner JCY planned to reopen JCY's case #81-0148 in the U.S. District Court for Hawaii District, in fairness for stronger "consolidation" of joined Contributory Respondents; and/or, for most just adjudication of Petitioner's case(s).

2. that, on July 18, 1983, a letter was sent to Judge Samuel King, requesting Approval for filing of JCY's AFFIDAVITED MOTION FOR RELIEF, etc. according to FRCP, RULE

60(b)(1 to 6); and it was learned that Judge King and all Judges, including visiting Judge Waters, were on Kauai Island, attending the Judges' conference; and the clerks (Akana) refused to let Judge Schwarzer speak to Petitioner JCY, and this happened all week of July 18 to July 22, 1983. (APPENDIX 8/2/83–1)

3. that, on Monday July 25, 1983, in the U.S.District Court, Petitioner JCY tried to file the AFFIDAVITED MOTION FOR RELIEF, etc.; wherefore Judge King's secretary said he wasn't going to do anything about the AFFIDAVITED MOTIONs.

4. that, this AFFIDAVITED MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM (JUDGMENT)/ORDER OF AUGUST 10, 1982; ACCORDING TO FRCP*, RULE 60(b); AND AFFIDAVITED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PEADINGS" with AFFIDAVITED MEMORANDUMS, ARGUMENTS, APPENDICES, AND EXHIBIT (FOR THE COURT ONLY) in "SUPPORT" (APP. 8/2/82–2) was denied filing by the clerks of the U.S.District Court, whereof Chief Clerk Walter Chinn and clerk Ione Akana are liable also, unless it is true that they took orders from the Court then; since they denied filing, even after discussion of the merits of filing a MOTION according to FRCP* RULE 60(b), giving Plaintiff (or movant) the right for filing before consideration, without "approval" from any Judge, especially if the "order" was for "no filing of motions".

5. that, this AFFIDAVITED MOTIONs was presented before one (1) year's time, according to FRCP* RULE 60(b), in particular (1–3).

6. that, Judges Pence, and Fong were also requested orally to approve of filing of the AFFIDAVITED MOTIONs; on July 25, and each day thereafter until July 29, 1983, Friday, the three Judges of the U.S. District Court were requested through their secretaries to send oral or written orders for the clerks to file the MOTIONs.

7. that on July 26, 1983, a letter (APP. 8/2/83–3) was sent along with the AFFIDAVITED MOTIONs (APP. 8/2/83–2), to all parties involved.

8. that, on Thursday, July 28, 1983; trying again, letters were sent to all three Judges (APP. 8/2/83–4) to request APPROVAL of, (and order) filing of Plaintiff's AFFIDAVITED MOTIONs. Along with the letter, was included a copy of the July 18 letter to Judge King; and copies of the filed coversheets for case #82-2142 and its A–10 application; informing the clerk and

secretaries that the Judges were involved in case #82-2142 (USSC), and being defended by the U.S. Attorney General's office. Copies of the USSC#82-2142 JOINT PETITION were brought to the office for them and the Hawaii Supreme Court, on August 1, 1983; wherefore both parties were served at the respective Attorney General's offices, in proper time.

9. that, on Friday July 29, a copy of page 3 of the JOINT PETITION (USSC#82-2142) was also served on the Judges, notifying them of Joinder as Contributory Respondents; and giving every opportunity to exonerate themselves, instead of the now proven judicial conflict for perpetrated obstructive, coercive, prejudiced depriving violations of Petitioner JCY's "equal protection" "of the Law" for all "civil RIGHTS", and to prosecute Respondents (Defendants there), who caused the Respondents AAYee & Associates (HSC#7355) and ex-husband AAYee (HSC#7067) of #82-2142 here, to therefore gain unfair use of JCY's uncollected compensation from twenty (20) years of work and marriage, and JCY's moneys from Sept. 16, 1971 initiation of divorce to present, of interest lost by judicial malpractice assassinatory court orders of "incapacitated" label, which injured Petitioner for fast collection of moneys (from NOTE "A" & "B" repayment of forced loan to AAYee, not even financial settlement as fact) as pled, and self management of JCY's moneys, with established equal rights for FREEDOM, all injured by violation neglect of "equal protection of law".

10. that, as pled, JCY's injuries being perpetrated by the judiciary, also aided Hawaii State Government in unfair gain by Governor Ariyoshi's corruptive appointments of only Judges who were actively restraintively perpetrating the depriving, perjured, libelled violations of Petitoner's RIGHTS of equal protection, for reputation, as capable, to run for political office against the Hawaii State incumbents, or Hawaii Federal incumbents, also in unfair competition, unequal opportunity conspiracy, coercing oppression of Petitioner Pro Se Janic Ching Yee, who asserts all RIGHTS for REDRESS/RECOVERY, for better strength of this Court's JURISDICTION for Constitutional Law, and TITLE 42's sections 1981, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1986, and 1988, as applicable.

11. that, on Saturday, July 30, 1983, "denials" were received from Judge King and Judge Fong (APP. 8/2/83–5,6), and whereof on Monday, Aug. 1, 1983, it was affirmed by Judge Pence's

office that he also "denied" approval.

12. that, therefore, the three Judges, Pence, King and Fong of the U.S.District Court of Hawaii, proved their conflict for "discriminatory" involvement, by their prejudiced, bad intent coercion for non-assertion of injured Petitioner JCY's rights, even with prayers for their possible exoneration, which they instead proved definitely guilty, (per JILLSON v. CAPRIO: "ANY WHO AID A FALSE ARREST IS GUILTY!") for injury of JCY's person and JCY's RIGHTS for equal protection RIGHTS, against Judges also who took advantage of their positions of trust, to hurt JCY, one woman alone, with merits for claims for REDRESS/RECOVERY as good capable, American-born woman, who prays for consideration by this Court's discretion, initiative, prerogative, and JURISDICTION for strong CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, as America's foundation.

13. that, the Courts which order perjury, and "no more motions" do not give opportunity to argue against judicial error of considering the wrong case, as error of divorce proceedings (not case USDC(Hi)#81-0148) and consequently unfair "denials/dismissals" and no Hearing for USDC(HI)#81-0148 yet; wherefore the U.S.District Court curelly refused to file new COMPLAINT for HEARING of case USDC(Hi)#81-0148; presented October 18, 1982. **

14. that prayers are for this whole Court's consideration of this new evidence, with this Court's RULES, 26, 27, 44, for its discretion against malpractice judiciary in the Hawaii Supreme Court, Hawaii Circuit Court, Hawaii Family Court, Hawaii's U.S.District Court, and the U.S.Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit; who coerce exhaustion of any way for remedy from their Courts, which cruelly are unwilling to consider/determine real REDRESS/RECOVERY for Petitioner Janice Ching Yee, who has proven all merits in many present exceptional circumstances, of JCY's capability, with Petitions or Pleas of truth, and should have Court Order as capable, instead of being still under Hawaii Family Court Judge Vitousek's "cloud" as "incapacitated", denied reversal by all Judges after her; and ignored by the lower Appeals Courts who know of Petitioner as capable owner registrant of all work copyrighted by Petitioner for pleadings; injured yet by the cruel conspired intrinsic fraud, for humiliation of good Petitioner.

** 1 duplicate of "denied"
filing-pleadings included for the Court only

15. that, because of the lower Court's hesitancy and conspired resultant depriving violations of equal protection of the law, as pled, "adequate relief cannot be had in any other form, or from any other court", than this Court, and REDRESS/RECOVERY for Petitioner can set the best precedent for equal protection of law for equal RIGHTS, therefore for the lower Courts to follow, and therefore, JCY's "EXTRAORDINARY WRIT" "will be in aid" of this "Court's appellate jurisdiction", with strong use of U.S.CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENTS 1,4, 5,7,8,9,13, and 14 in particular, for most proper use in all pertinent courts.

16. that, in addition, Petitioner requested President Ronald Reagan to include Petitioner's prayers for GRANT OF FREEDOM, for equal RIGHT for use of the U.S.CONSTITUTION's ARTICLE II, Sec. 2; also for equal protection of the law for us who are lawful good citizens as Petitioner Pro Se Janice Ching Yee, who never committed crime, or was convicted of crime; and therefore prays for this Court's help in this matter which can help "this Court's appellate jurisdiction", not being acted on by President Reagan yet; for this matter of great concern for betterment of America as lawful nation, with FREEDOM of good citizens who should have more FREEDOM and RIGHTS than convicts or others who injure us by their "intrinsic fraud" perjured orders, as judicial misconduct oppression by majority racial prejudiced animus under color of illegal state law, as Hawaii Family Court's Rule 7(b)(5), which should not be considered LAW; as pled.

17. that, also, "to aid this Court's Jurisdiction" to do its best for proper review of cases; Petitioner prays for this Court to reprimand the clerk who twice sent back Petitioner's "CERTIFIED PORTIONS OF RECORDS ON APPEAL" sent to this Court for more just adjudication review/determination of Petitioner's case(s). This Court could investigate the clerk(s) and order them to pay JCY for the extra postage spent because of their coercion, in violation of this COURT'S RULES, RULE 13 and 19.1 and 19.2: wherefore the clerks of the Hawaii Supreme Court refused to send the RECORDS unless ordered by this Court. Petitioner prays for this Court to order for this "CERTIFIED PORTIONS OF THE RECORDS ON APPEAL" be sent up to this Court for consideration/best determination.

18. that, in addition, from this day, Petitioner JCY prays for recusal of Justice Rehnquist, who (7/13/83) prejudicedly denied Petitioner's proper JOINT MOTION TO STAY THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE JUDGMENT(S) OF (CASES HSC#7067 and HSC#7355) WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT; wherefore the Court's clerks denied filing of Petitioner's proper JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT ORDER WHICH DENIED MOTION TO STAY, sent to the Court on July 19, 1983; and therefore showed inconsistancy, having once filed Petitioner's MOTION FOR RELIEF regarding denial of MOTION TO STAY THE ENFORCEMENT (case #81–1500); and with merits for USSCR, RULES 33.7 and 42(c), or even RULE 51. and precedent of WHITE v BLOOM, for timeliness.

19. that, the denial by Justice Rehnquist, was in spite of the fact that all Respondents defaulted for answer in defense of the JOINT MOTION TO STAY THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE JUDGMENT(S), etc., and defaulted for answer/defense of JCY's MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT ORDER WHICH DENIED MOTION TO STAY, etc., denied filing by the clerks; wherefore the JOINT MOTION TO STAY, etc., gave Petitioner JCY true merit and reason for protection of Petitioner's RIGHTS and person, now fearful of the cruel prejudiced colluded animus coercion for non-assertion of JCY's RIGHTS, of U.S.CONSTITUTION's AMENDMENTS 1,4,5,7,9,13, and 14 in particular, and this Court's RULES 17(b & c), regarding the conflict of State Courts for deprivation of any good Americanborn citizen for Federal U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, and therefore subject to this Court's JURISDICTION, and review/determination.

20. that, the denial by Justice Rehnquist contributes to the perpetrated delay of release of Petitioner, for FREEDOM, and release of Petitioner's money out of Notes "A" & "B", so Petitioner can open shop, as part of FREEDOM, for Petitioner's Pi PRESS with books to show, and branch Dress Investment, with clothes to show.

21. that, in CONCLUSION, Petitioner argues and prays for extension of time, according to precedent RULING of WHITE v. BLOOM, as pled, in JOINT PETITION's APPENDIX "G", No. 33; to REOPEN case USSC#81-1500, and CONSOLIDATE (per FRCP, RULE 42) to this case USSC#82-2142, for the most

just adjudication and determination of this case(s), as pled for eight and a half (8½) years by JCY as real Pro Se, in all Courts involved, which injured Petitioner's "equal protection" RIGHTS for CIVIL RIGHTS, and who prays for GRANT of "EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT" and all JOINT MOTIONS" presented for this case, with the JOINT PETITION's AFFIDAVIT applicable here too, praying these ARGUMENTS are pertinent for this GRANT.

22. that, also, all APPENDICES noted and already duplicated, be used, instead of reprinting; to save money as reasonable.

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Petitioner Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Avenue, Honolulu, HI 96817

Dated, once August 2, 1983.
Now dated, September 1, 1983.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this JOINT MOTION FOR RELIEF, ACCORDING TO FRCP, RULE 60(b)(2), will be served for this day, by hand delivery on all parties, except parties in Washington, D.C., by certified mail;

Attorney Ed. Y.C.Chun, of Chun, Kerr & Dodd;
for Respondent Alfred A. Yee, and Alfred A. Yee & Associates
at: Suite 1408, of 700 Bishop Street, Hon, HI 96813

Attorney Wm. Fleming, & Thos. Crowley, of Cades, Schutte, Fleming and Wright; for Contributory Respondents:
Robert G. Hogan, Harold Nickelsen, James E. Koshiba and the Hawaii State Bar Association, and Dan Heely
at: Suite 1200, of 1000 Bishop Street, Hon, HI 96813

Hawaii Attorney General, Hon Tany Hong and Deputies
for Contributory Respondents related to Hawaii State Gov't.
at: Hawaii State Capitol, 415 S. Beretania St., Hon, HI 96813

Attorney Benjamin Carroll of A Law Corporation
for Contributory Respondent Dr. Kwon Yen Lum
at: Suite 301, of 225 S. Queen St., Hon. HI 96813

Attorney John Parks, for self as Contributory Respondent
at: Suite 1640, of 190 S. King Street, Hon. HI 96813

Attorney Wm. McCorriston, of Goodsill, Anderson, Quinn,Stifel
for Contributory Respondent Edward Y. C. Chun, et al
at: Suite 1600 of 111 S. King Street, Hon, HI 96813
(Castle & Cooke Building)

Contributory Respondent Stephanie Kokernak
c/o clerk of the Court, USSC((FRCP, RULE 5(b))

Hon. U. S. Attorney General William French Smith
cor Contributory Respondents related to U.S.Gov't., and
Contributory for Hawaii State Gov't. which gained unfairly.
at: U.S.Department of Justice
Washington, D.C., 20530

Hon. U. S. Solicitor General Rex E. Lee
at: U.S.Department of Justice
Washington, D.C., 20530

Dated this September 1, 1983.

/s/ Mrs. Janice Ching Yee

Mrs. Janice Ching Yee, Petitioner Pro Se
at: 3169 Alika Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96817

APPENDICES

ALL APPENDICES are appended separately:

1. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 1
2. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 2
3. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 3
4. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 4
5. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 5
6. APPENDIX 8/2/83 – 6